Kibble-Zurek Scaling in Periodically-Driven Quantum Systems

Angelo Russomanno[1, 2, 3] and Emanuele G. Dalla Torre[1]

[1] *Department of Physics, Bar Ilan University, 52900, Ramat Gan Israel*
[2] *Scuola Normale Superiore, Piazza dei Cavalieri 7, I-56127 Pisa, Italy*
[3] *International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Strada Costiera 11, I-34151 Trieste, Italy*

We study the slow crossing of non-equilibrium quantum phase transitions in periodically-driven systems. We explicitly consider a spin chain with a uniform time-dependent magnetic field and focus on the Floquet state that is adiabatically connected to the ground state of the static model. We find that this *Floquet ground state* undergoes a series of quantum phase transitions characterized by a non-trivial topology. To dinamically probe these transitions, we propose to start with a large driving frequency and slowly decrease it as a function of time. Combining analytical and numerical methods, we uncover a Kibble-Zurek scaling that persists in the presence of moderate interactions. This scaling can be used to experimentally demonstrate non-equilibrium transitions that cannot be otherwise observed.

PACS numbers:

arXiv:1510.08866v2 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 11 Feb 2016

Recent experiments on artificial quantum many-body systems demonstrated quantum-coherent evolution under various external perturbations [1, 1–4] and triggered the study of fundamental aspects of quantum non-equilibrium physics. One important direction is the quest for universal properties in the dynamics [4–11]. A universal non-equilibrium behaviour can originate from the universality of an underlying equilibrium problem [5, 6]: A well known example is offered by the Kibble-Zurek (K-Z) scaling observed when crossing a quantum phase transition (QPT) [4, 7, 12–14]. In addition, recent studies found evidence of genuine non-equilibrium universality following a quantum quench [8–11], or in presence of a time-dependent noise [15, 16]. Another important direction is the exploration of the conditions for an asymptotic steady state [4, 17–40]. In the context of quantum quenches, it was found that systems with a continuous spectrum generically relax to a diagonal ensemble [37, 38]. Current investigations focus on understanding when this asymptotic condition is thermal (ergodic dynamics) and when it is not (regular dynamics) [20, 21, 23–25, 39]. The transition from regular to ergodic dynamics is connected to the emergence of quantum chaos [41–43] and to the many-body localization/delocalization transition [24, 25, 39, 44–48]. These studies are deeply related to the main problem of statistical mechanics: how microscopic quantum coherent dynamics can induce macroscopic thermalization [20, 39, 49, 50].

In this work we address the universal scaling and the absence of thermalization in periodically-driven many-body systems [51–77]. We focus on Floquet states, the eigenstates of the periodically driven dynamics. We specifically address a Floquet state analogous to the ground state of the considered system without driving. This state, which we term "Floquet ground state" (FGS), shows an area-law entanglement entropy, in contrast to thermal steady states whose entanglement grows as a volume law [56]. Furthermore, the FGS can undergo second-order quantum phase transitions. In the case of an integrable spin-chain model, we show that these transitions are associated with the closing of a Floquet gap and separate non-equilibrium phases with distinct topology. Next, we discuss how to dynamically probe such transitions: in contrast to the static case, the Floquet ground state in general cannot be found either numerically or experimentally at an extremum of the spectrum of some Hamiltonian. We propose to reach the FGS by initially preparing the system at high frequency in the ground state of the time-averaged Hamiltonian – which in the high frequency limit coincides with the FGS – and then slowly decreasing the driving frequency. In this way we can adiabatically follow the FGS, until a non-equilibrium transition is crossed. We discover that this crossing is marked by a Kibble-Zurek scaling of physical observables (we define this phenomenon "Floquet Kibble-Zurek"), which can be used to determine the position and critical exponents of the transition.

Because the entanglement entropy remains small during the dynamical crossing of the transition, this process can be efficiently studied with the time-dependent DMRG algorithm. We find that the Floquet-Kibble-Zurek scaling persists even in the presence of moderate integrability-breaking terms. It is important to stress that, in spite of the slowness of the crossing, the adiabatic theorem [78–80] does not directly apply. Due to the folding of the Floquet spectrum (described in detail later), interactions can in principle give rise to a large number of exponentially small gaps which will prevent the observation of the transition. The persistence of the non-equilibrium transition is probably connected with its topological nature, which prevents these gaps from opening. We conjecture that in the presence of larger interactions a strong mixing of the Floquet states is expected, leading to Floquet states obeying Eigenstate Thermalization [20, 49, 50, 62, 65, 67].

Floquet theory [81–83] is the basis of our analysis. For any time-periodic Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}(t + 2\pi/\Omega)$, it is possible to find a complete basis of solutions of the Schrödinger equation (the Floquet states) which are periodic up to a phase $|\Psi_{\gamma,\Omega}(t)\rangle = \mathrm{e}^{-i\bar{\mu}_\gamma t}|\Phi_{\gamma,\Omega}(t)\rangle$. The many-body quasi-energies $\bar{\mu}_\gamma$ are real, and the Floquet modes $|\Phi_{\gamma,\Omega}(t)\rangle$ are periodic. These states are analogous to the Bloch wave eigenfunctions of space-periodic Hamiltonians [83, 84]. Like the Bloch quasi-momenta, the quasi-energies are not unique and are defined up to translations of an integer number of Ω [82]. In this way, the whole Floquet spectrum can be folded in any interval of length Ω which defines thereby a Brillouin zone. Like eigenenergies, the quasi-energies can become degenerate: two of them taken in the same Brillouin zone are degenerate (or in resonance) if they coincide or if they differ by Ω. Each degeneracy in the Floquet spectrum corresponds to a many-photon resonance in the system [82]. Floquet states and quasi-energies can be extracted from the evolution operator $\hat{U}(t,0)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \tau$: we have $\hat{U}(\tau,0) = \exp\left(-i\hat{H}_{F,\Omega}(0)\tau\right)$ with the so-called "Floquet Hamiltonian" defined as $\hat{H}_{F,\Omega}(t) \equiv \sum_\gamma \bar{\mu}_\gamma |\Phi_{\gamma,\Omega}(t)\rangle\langle\Phi_{\gamma,\Omega}(t)|$, where $\bar{\mu}_\gamma$ are conventionally taken in the first Brillouin zone $[-\Omega/2, \Omega/2]$ and $t \in [0, \tau)$.

In the present work we prepare the system in the ground state of the time-averaged Hamiltonian: in the high-frequency limit it coincides with the Floquet Hamiltonian [63]. If we decrease the frequency adiabatically, the initial state is transported [78–80] to its Floquet state adiabatic continuation: the FGS. In general the FGS is not the ground state of the Floquet Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_{F,\Omega}(0)$, because the quasi-energies are folded in the first Brillouin zone. From a formal perspective, for an infinitesimal change $\Omega \to \Omega - \delta\Omega$, the adiabatic continuation of $|\Phi_{\gamma,\Omega}(0)\rangle$ is given by the Floquet state $|\Phi_{\eta,\Omega-\delta\Omega}(0)\rangle$ where η is defined by maximizing the transition probability $|\langle\Phi_{\eta,\Omega-\delta\Omega}(0)\,|\Phi_{\gamma,\Omega}(0)\rangle|^2$. In analogy to the ground state of static systems, the FGS can undergo (non-equilibrium) quantum phase transitions, whose properties we wish to analyze.

To exemplify our general arguments, we consider a homogeneous quantum Ising chain (see Ref. [85–87] for the experimental realization of this model with trapped atoms and ions):

$$\hat{H}^{(\alpha)}(t) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{L}\left[J\hat{\sigma}_j^z\hat{\sigma}_{j+1}^z + h(t)\hat{\sigma}_j^x + \alpha\,\hat{\sigma}_j^z\hat{\sigma}_{j+2}^z\right] . \quad (1)$$

Here, the $\hat{\sigma}_j^{x,z}$ are spins (Pauli matrices) at site j of a chain of length L, the J is a longitudinal nearest neighbour coupling, the α a longitudinal next-nearest-neighbour coupling and the $h(t)$ a transverse field. We assume in all the paper $J = 1$ and start our analysis by considering $\alpha = 0$. Although at this point the model is integrable, it describes many universal properties of



FIG. 1: Second derivative of the Floquet ground state (FGS) quasi-energy versus the driving frequency, displaying second-order divergences in correspondence to each non-equilibrium transition. The labels l and p identify the transitions, and the winding-number w sets the topological order parameter of the different phases. (Inset) Half-chain entanglement entropy of the FGS versus the system size L (the considered frequencies are indicated by the corresponding points in the horizontal axis of the main figure). $S_{L/2}$(FGS) grows logarithmically at the transitions, and follows an area law (saturates for large L) elsewhere. (Numerical parameters: $h_0 = 2.3$, $A = 1.0$, $L = 200$ in the main figure, periodic boundary conditions.)

1d models with the same symmetry: as we will see, we propose that the same can happen for the properties of the FGS in the non-equilibrium case. Through a Jordan-Wigner transformation [88], $\hat{H}^{(0)}(t)$ can be reduced to an integrable quadratic-fermion form. (see Refs. [6, 31, 32, 63, 64, 68, 88–90] for details). After a Fourier transform, the Hamiltonian can be decomposed in $L/2$ 2×2 blocks of the form $\hat{H}_k^{(0)}(t) = \left[\epsilon_k(h(t))\left(\hat{c}_k^\dagger\hat{c}_k - \hat{c}_{-k}\hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger\right) - i\Delta_k\left(\hat{c}_k^\dagger\hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger - \hat{c}_{-k}\hat{c}_k\right)\right]$ ($\hat{c}_k$ are fermionic destruction operator) and the time-dependent Schrödinger equation is solved by a BCS-like state. We numerically calculate, for each k, the two single-particle Floquet modes [63, 64] $|\phi_k^\pm(t)\rangle = \left(v_k^\pm(t) + u_k^\pm(t)\hat{c}_k^\dagger\hat{c}_{-k}^\dagger\right)|0\rangle$ and the quasi-energies (in the first Brillouin zone) $\pm\mu_k$. For this model, we can *explicitly evaluate* the FGS: it has the BCS-like form $|\Phi_{\mathrm{FGS}}(t)\rangle = \prod_{k>0}|\phi_k^-(t)\rangle$ with quasi-energy $\bar{\mu}_{\mathrm{FGS}} = -\sum_{k>0}\mu_k$.

This model shows a series of interesting Floquet resonances [6, 68]. They are discussed in detail in Ref. [6], where it is shown that their positions depend only on the time-averaged value h_0 of the periodic drive $h(t)$. They are associated to many-photon resonances and occur only at $k = 0,\ \pi$. The $k = 0$-resonances occur when $2|h_0 - 1| = p\,\Omega$, the $k = \pi$-ones if $2|h_0 + 1| = l\Omega$ ($p,\ l \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the order of the resonance) [6].

In this work we find that the resonances actually mark a series of non-equilibrium QPTs where the properties of the FGS change. To see that, we compute $S_{L/2}$(FGS), the half-chain entanglement entropy of $|\Phi_{\mathrm{FGS}}(0)\rangle$. We find that $S_{L/2}$(FGS) grows logarithmically with L at the resonance points while it remains constant elsewhere (see



FIG. 2: (Left panel) Number of excitations vs Ω for different values of t_f: it starts increasing after crossing the transition. (Right panel) Kibble-Zurek scaling of the number of excitations: the rescaled curves for different t_f overlap after the rescaling (the overlap is not perfect because we initialize the system in the ground state of the average Hamiltonian, see SM for details). (Numerical parameters: $h_0 = 2.3$, $A = 1$, $L = 300$, $\Omega_i = 10$, $\Omega_f = 4$; periodic boundary conditions.)

the inset of Fig. 1); the same happens at equilibrium for the ground-state QPT [91, 92]. Remarkably the quasi-energy is *non-analytic* at the resonance points: its second derivative with respect to Ω diverges (see Fig. 1). This means that at these points the Floquet Hamiltonian undergoes QPTs of second order [13]. In order to simplify the numerical analysis, we obtain the results in Fig. 1 applying a square-wave driving of the form $h(t) = h_0 + A\,\mathrm{sign}\,(\sin(\Omega t))$ (the same is done in Refs. [56, 57, 61, 62, 76, 93, 94]). However, we stress that the specific form of the driving does not affect the position in the parameter space of the resonances – which only depends on h_0 and Ω – and the nature of the non-analiticities occurring there. In contrast to the well-known static case, the non-equilibrium transitions are not characterized by a local order parameter. We find that they are of topological nature and are characterized by a $\mathbb{Z}$ topological invariant, the winding number w (see Ref. [95] and Fig. 1). Considering the time-reversal invariant point $t = \pi/\Omega$ [96], the Floquet Hamiltonian at this time $\hat{H}^{(0)}_{F,\Omega}(\pi/\Omega)$ can be factorized in 2×2 blocks which can be represented as $f_y(k)\sigma_y + f_z(k)\sigma_z$ (thanks to time-reversal invariance, there is no component along σ_x); defining $f(k) \equiv f_y(k) + i f_z(k)$, the winding number is defined as [95] $w \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathrm{d}k \frac{d}{dk} \log f(k)$. From a geometric perspective, w is the number of times the vector $\big(\ f_y(k),\ \ f_z(k)\ \big)$ turns around the origin $\big(\ 0,\ \ 0\ \big)$ in counterclockwise sense, when k moves from $-\pi$ to π. These transitions are reminiscent of those occurring in Floquet topological insulators [71–74] and are a manifestation of a genuine many-body phenomenon: we will see that they persist in presence of interactions.

The linear crossing of one of these non-equilibrium transitions leads to a K-Z-scaling phenomenon which we define "Floquet Kibble-Zurek". In order to observe it, we apply to the system a time-dependent drive of the form $h(t) = h_0 + A\,\mathrm{sign}\,[\sin(\phi(t))]$ where we linearly ramp the instantaneous frequency, $\Omega(t) = \frac{d}{dt}\phi(t) = \Omega_i + (\Omega_f - \Omega_i)\frac{t}{t_f}$. We specifically choose Ω_f below Ω_c, but above the other transitions and Ω_i quite larger than Ω_c. Ω_i is large enough that the ground state of the time-averaged Hamiltonian is a very good approximation for the FGS: we prepare the system in this ground state and we ramp it in a time t_f to Ω_f: We cross the first ($l = 1$) non-equilibrium transition at frequency Ω_c. The adiabatic limit of this protocol is attained when $t_f \to \infty$, implying that t_f is our adiabaticity parameter.

We can see that, beyond the critical point Ω_c, adiabaticity breaks down and fluctuations cannot adiabatically follow the FGS; this results in the creation of excitations whose density is n_{ex} (see Fig. 2). Note that in our case n_{ex} is not directly related to a density of defects: there are no defects due to the absence of a local order parameter. The numerical results of Fig. 2 show a very clear K-Z scaling of the form $n_{\mathrm{ex}} = t_f^{-1/2}\mathcal{N}\left((\Omega_c - \Omega)t_f^{1/2}\right)$. A similar scaling is obeyed by the energy difference with respect to the FGS. To observe these quantities it is however necessary to compare the dynamics with the FGS, which is generically not accessible in experiments and numerical methods like t-DMRG. In contrast, objects of experimental interest show at most a scaling along the $\Omega - \Omega_c$ axis. For instance, the derivative of the transverse magnetization $ds_x/d\Omega$ ($\hat{s}_x = \frac{1}{L}\sum_j \hat{\sigma}^x_j$) shows very clear oscillations which obey a "partial" scaling law in t_f. Indeed, the nodes of the oscillations overlap if the results for different t_f are plotted vs $(\Omega - \Omega_c)\,t_f^{1/2}$, but the oscillation amplitudes do not show a clear scaling (see Fig. 3(a),(b)).

To study the non-integrable case ($\alpha \neq 0$ in Eq. (1)) we employ the openMPS package [97, 98] to directly compute the time evolution of the system. As in the integrable case, we initialize the system in the ground state of the time-averaged Hamiltonian. In contrast to the case of sudden quenches where the entanglement entropy and the truncation error rapidly grow in time, we find that for our protocol both quantities remain very small for long times (see SM for details). To observe the Floquet Kibble-Zurek scaling, we still plot the derivative of the transverse magnetization $ds_x/d\Omega$ as a function of the driving frequency Ω, for different values of the adiabatic parameter t_f. As shown in Fig. 3, each curve oscillates differently but the nodes of all the curves overlap if plotted versus $(\Omega - \Omega_c)t_f^{\beta}$.

The two fitting parameters Ω_c and t_f are chosen to minimize the distance between the rescaled curves (see SM for details). Interestingly, the overlap between the curves extends beyond the strict validity of the numerical precision, in the region of large truncation error (gray areas in Fig. 3), and provides further indications of the correctness of the scaling. By comparing different fitting procedures we obtain that for $\alpha = 0.1$, $\Omega_c = 6.78 \pm 0.16$ and $\beta = 0.51 \pm 0.09$, while for $\alpha = 0.3$, $\Omega_c = 6.6 \pm 0.3$ and $\beta = 0.44 \pm 0.09$. These values are consistent



FIG. 3: K-Z scaling of the transverse magnetization derivative crossing a non-equilibrium QPT. (a-b) At the integrable point $\alpha = 0$ the system allows for an exact solution and displays a clear scaling behavior close to the resonance (at $\Omega_c = 6.6$); we plot also the FGS value diverging at the transition. (c-d) For small values of the integrability breaking term $\alpha = 0.1$, an exact solution is not available, but our numerical results are consistent with a K-Z scaling. (e-f) Far from integrability, at $\alpha = 0.3$, the K-Z scaling still persists with approximately the same exponent. The values of $\Omega_c(\alpha)$ and $\beta(\alpha)$ used in subplots (b) and (d) were found by maximizing the distance between the rescaled functions. In the gray regions the truncation error is large (see SM) (Numerical parameters: $h_0 = 2.3,\ A = 1,\ M = 30,\ \Omega_i = 10,\ \Omega_f = 4$, open boundary conditions. $L = 300$ in panels (a-b), $L = 100$ in panels (c-f).)

with a universal scaling with the same exponent as in the integrable case, $\beta = 0.5$, but the large error-bars do not allow us to make a strong statement. Note that in one dimension there are cases of topological transitions at equilibrium with continuously varying critical exponents (see for example Ref. [99–101]). To address this question it is necessary to improve the quality of the numerical method (we keep here only up to $M = 30$ eigenstates of the density matrix) by employing parallelized algorithms, which go beyond the scope of the present paper.

In conclusion, we find – in a many-body system – a low-entanglement Floquet state analogous to the ground state. We adiabatically follow it until a many-body Floquet resonance occurs: the low entanglement gives the possibility to numerically study non-integrable models by means of t-DMRG. We explicitly discuss the case of an integrable model where the many-body resonances are non-equilibrium phase transitions of the FGS. We see a strict analog of the K-Z scaling when crossing the highest of these transitions: this phenomenon allows us to identify a similar effect for moderate non-integrabilities as well. This is highly non-trivial, considering the high degree of folding and mixing of the Floquet spectrum of a driven interacting many-body system. We find that the integrable transitions have topological properties which should persist for weak interactions. The persistence of the critical behaviour for moderate interactions suggests the absence of many-body delocalization of the FGS. Although other parts of the Floquet spectrum may undergo many-body delocalization [56, 57, 60–62, 102], our method does not give the possibility to directly observe it. Our results were obtained by means of limited resources [97]: the resulting uncertainty does not allow us to clarify what happens in our system for large interactions. Further work is therefore needed to see if the FGS itself can undergo many-body delocalization in our model and in other interesting 1d systems [56, 57, 60–62, 102].

Acknowledgments We acknowledge useful discussions with E. Berg, R. Berkovitz, R. Fazio and E. Demler. Research was supported by the Coleman-Soref foundation, by the Israeli Science Foundation (grant number 1542/14) and by the EU FP7 under grant agreement n. 641122 (STREP-QUIC).

[1] A. A. Houck, H. E. Türeci, and J. Koch, Nature Physics **8**, 292 (2012).
[2] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 885 (2008).
[3] I. Bloch, Nature **453**, 1016 (2008).
[4] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 863 (2011).
[5] E. G. Dalla Torre, E. Demler, and A. Polkovnikov, Physical Review Letters **110**, 090404 (2013).
[6] A. Russomanno, S. Sharma, A. Dutta, and G. E. Santoro, JSTAT p. P08030 (2015).
[7] W. H. Zurek, U. Dorner, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 105701 (2005).
[8] C. De Grandi, V. Gritsev, and A. Polkovnikov, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 012303 (2010).
[9] J. Berges, K. Boguslavski, S. Schlichting, and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 061601 (2015).
[10] R. Vasseur, J. P. Dahlhaus, and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 041007 (2014).
[11] C. Latta, F. Haupt, M. Hanl, A. Weichselbaum, M. Claassen, W. Wuester, P. Fallahi, S. Faelt, L. Glazman, J. von Delft, et al., Nature **474**, 627630 (2011).
[12] A. Polkovnikov, Physical Review B **72**, 161201(R) (2005).
[13] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions (Second Edition)* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
[14] H. Saberi, T. Opatrny, K. Molmer, and A. del Campo, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 060301(R) (2014).
[15] E. G. Dalla Torre, E. Demler, T. Giamarchi, and E. Altman, Nature Physics **6**, 806810 (2010).
[16] J. Marino and S. Diehl, arXiv (2015), 1508.02723.

[17] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. W. Hansch, and I. Bloch, Nature (London) **419**, 51 (2002).
[18] T. Kinoshita, T. Wenger, and D. S. Weiss, Nature (London) **440**, 900 (2006).
[19] T. Barthel and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 100601 (2008).
[20] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
[21] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, V. Yurovsky, and M. Olshanii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 050405 (2007).
[22] C. Kollath, A. M. Läuchli, and E. Altman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 180601 (2007).
[23] S. R. Manmana, S. Wessel, R. M. Noack, and A. Muramatsu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 210405 (2007).
[24] E. Canovi, D. Rossini, R. Fazio, G. E. Santoro, and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 094431 (2011).
[25] C. Neuenhahn and F. Marquardt, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 060101(R) (2012).
[26] M. Kollar and M. Eckstein, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 013626 (2008).
[27] M. Eckstein and M. Kollar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 120404 (2008).
[28] M. A. Cazalilla, PRL **97**, 156403 (2006).
[29] A. Iucci and M. A. Cazalilla, PRA **80**, 063619 (2009).
[30] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. p. 0706:P06008 (2007), cond-mat.stat-mech/0704.1880.
[31] P. Calabrese, F. H. L. Essler, and M. Fagotti, J. Stat. Mech. p. P07016 (2012).
[32] P. Calabrese, F. H. L. Essler, and M. Fagotti, J. Stat. Mech. p. P07022 (2012).
[33] M. Cramer, C. M. Dawson, J. Eisert, and T. J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 030602 (2008).
[34] M. Cramer, A. Flesch, I. P. McCulloch, U. Schollwock, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 063001 (2008).
[35] S. Trotzky, Y.-A. Chen, A. Flesch, I. P. M. Culloch, U. Schollwöck, J. Eisert, and I. Bloch, Nature Physics **8**, 325 (2012).
[36] M. Cramer and J. Eisert, New J. Phys. **12**, 055020 (2010).
[37] S. Ziraldo, A. Silva, and G. E. Santoro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 247205 (2012).
[38] S. Ziraldo and G. E. Santoro, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 064201 (2013).
[39] L. F. Santos and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. E p. 031130 (2010).
[40] P. Smacchia, M. Knap, E. Demler, and A. Silva, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 205136 (2015).
[41] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, arXiv (2015), 1509.06411.
[42] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos (*2^{nd} *Ed.)* (Springer, 2001).
[43] G. Casati and L. Molinari, Prog. Theor. Phys. Supp. **98**, 287 (1989).
[44] B. L. Altshuler, Y. Gefen, A. Kamenev, and L. S. Levitov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2803 (1997).
[45] D. M. Basko, I. L. Aleiner, and B. Altshuler, Annals of Physics **321**, 1126 (2006).
[46] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 174411 (2010).
[47] M. Schreiber, S. S. Hodgman, P. Bordia, H. P. Lüschen, M. H. Fischer, R. Vosk, E. Altman, U. Schneider, and I. Bloch, arXiv (2015), quant-ph/1501.05661.
[48] G. Casati, I. Guarneri, F. Izrailev, and R. Scharf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 5 (1990).
[49] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).
[50] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 888 (1994).
[51] H. Lignier, C. Sias, D. Ciampini, Y. P. Singh, A. Zenesini, O. Morsch, and E. Arimondo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 220403 (2007).
[52] A. Zenesini, H. Lignier, D. Ciampini, O. Morsch, and E. Arimondo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 100403 (2009).
[53] N. Gemelke, E. Sarajlic, Y. Bidel, S. Hong, and S. Chu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 170404 (2005).
[54] A. Eckardt, C. Weiss, and M. Holthaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 260404 (2005).
[55] C. Kollath, A. Iucci, T. Giamarchi, W. Hofstetter, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050402 (2006).
[56] P. Ponte, Z. Papić, F. Huveneers, and D. A. Abanin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 140401 (2015).
[57] P. Ponte, A. Chandran, Z. Papi, and D. A. Abanin, Annals of Physics **353**, 196 (2015).
[58] H. Kim, T. N. Ikeda, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 052105 (2014).
[59] G. Bunin, L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, and A. Polkovnikov, Nat. Phys. **7**, 913 (2011).
[60] R. Citro, E. G. Dalla Torre, L. D'Alessio, A. Polkovnikov, M. Babadi, T. Oka, and E. Demler, arXiv (2015), quant-ph/1501.05660.
[61] L. D'Alessio and A. Polkovnikov, Ann. Phys. **333**, 19 (2013).
[62] L. D'Alessio and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 041048 (2014).
[63] A. Russomanno, A. Silva, and G. E. Santoro, Phys. Rev. Lett **109**, 257201 (2012), 1204.5084.
[64] A. Russomanno, A. Silva, and G. E. Santoro, J. Stat. Mech. p. P09012 (2013), 1306.2805.
[65] A. Russomanno, R. Fazio, and G. E. Santoro, EPL **110**, 37005 (2015).
[66] A. Lazarides, A. Das, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 150401 (2014).
[67] A. Lazarides, A. Das, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 012110 (2014).
[68] V. M. Bastidas, C. Emary, G. Schaller, and T. Brandes, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 063627 (2012).
[69] T. Mori, T. Kuwahara, and K. Saito, arXiv (2015), cond-mat/1509.03968.
[70] M. Bukov, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Knap, and E. Demler, arXiv (2015), cond-mat.quant-gas/1507.01946.
[71] N. H. Lindner, G. Refael, and V. Galitski, Nature Physics **7**, 490495 (2011).
[72] L. Privitera and G. E. Santoro, arXiv (2015), quant-ph/1508.01883.
[73] G. Jotzu, M. Messer, R. Debousquois, M. Lebrat, T. Uelinger, D. Greif, and T. Esslinger, Nature **515**, 237 (2014).
[74] T. Oka and H. Aoki, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 081406 (2009).
[75] G. Salerno, T. Ozawa, H. M. Price, and I. Carusotto, arXiv (2015), cond-mat.mes-hall/1510.04697.
[76] M. Bukov, M. Heyl, D. A. Huse, and A. Polkovnikov, arXiv (2015), cond-mat.quant-gas/1512.02119.
[77] S. Sharma, A. Russomanno, G. E. Santoro, and A. Dutta, EPL p. 67003 (2014).
[78] A. Messiah, *Quantum mechanics*, vol. 2 (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1962).
[79] H. P. Breuer and M. Holthaus, Z. Phys. D **11**, 1 (1989).
[80] R. H. Young and W. J. Deal, J. Math. Phys. **11**, 3298 (1970).
[81] T. Dittrich, P. Hänggi, G.-L. Ingold, B. Kramer, G. Schön, and W. Zwerger, *Quantum Transport and*

Dissipation (Wiley-VCH Weinheim, 1998).
[82] J. H. Shirley, Phys. Rev. **138**, B979 (1965).
[83] J. Hausinger and M. Grifoni, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022117 (2010).
[84] G. Grosso and G. P. Parravicini, *Solid State Physics* (Academic, San Diego, 2000).
[85] J. Simon, W. S. Bakr, R. Ma, M. E. Tai, P. M. Preiss, and M. Greiner, Nature **472**, 307 (2011).
[86] K. Kim, M.-S. Chang, S. Korenblit, R. Islam, E. Edwards, J. Freericks, G.-D. Lin, L.-M. Duan, and C. Monroe, Nature **465**, 590 (2010).
[87] H. Labuhn, D. Barredo, S. Ravets, S. de Léséleuc, T. Macrì, T. Lahaye, and A. Browaeys, arXiv (2015), cond-mat.quant-gas/1509.04543.
[88] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, Annals of Physics **16**, 407 (1961).
[89] T. Caneva, R. Fazio, and G. E. Santoro, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 144427 (2007).
[90] R. W. Cherng and L. S. Levitov, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 043614 (2006).
[91] J. I. Latorre, E. Rico, and G. Vidal, Quantum Inf. Comput. **4**, 048 (2004).
[92] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).
[93] V. Khemani, A. Lazarides, R. Moessner, and L. D. Sondhi, arXiv (2015), quant-ph/1501.05660.
[94] A. Lazarides, A. Das, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 030402 (2015).
[95] J. Asbóth, L. Oroszlány, and A. Pályi, *Topological insulators* (2013), available at: `http://fizipedia.bme.hu/images/1/14/Topological_insulators.pdf`.
[96] T. Kitagawa, E. Berg, M. Rudner, and E. Demler, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 235114 (2010).
[97] We use the Open Source MPS by M. L. Wall and L. D. Carr: `http://sourceforge.net/projects/openmps/` in its non-parallelized version. The t-DMRG numerical calculations have been performed on Amazon Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2).
[98] M. L. Wall and L. D. Carr, New Journal of Physics **14**, 125015 (2012).
[99] H. J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 6372 (1986).
[100] K. Hida, Journal of the Physical Society of Japan **62**, 1466 (1993).
[101] E. Berg, E. G. Dalla Torre, T. Giamarchi, and E. Altman, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 245119 (2008).
[102] M. Genske and A. Rosch, arXiv (2015), cond-mat.quant-gas/1508.04551.